

REMARKS

In the Office Action¹, the Examiner rejected claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,953,724 to Lowry et al. ("*Lowry*").

In the present Amendment, Applicants propose to amend claims 1, 3, 4, 13, 21, and 22. Support for the claim amendments can be found in Applicants' specification at, for example, page 13, line 8 to page 17, line 6, and Fig. 2. Accordingly, Applicants submit that their proposed claim changes do not raise new issues.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-22 as allegedly being anticipated by *Lowry*. *Lowry* fails to disclose each and every element of any of claims 1-22, as required to sustain a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). For example, *Lowry* at least fails to teach the claimed "first area [of a parent class] including the second area [of a child class]," as recited in proposed amended claim 1.

The Examiner apparently contends that nodes 52 of the alleged "hierarchical structure" shown in Fig. 2A of *Lowry* constitute parent and child classes. Final Office Action at pages 3-4. Fig. 2A, however, clearly shows nodes 52 being spaced from one another. None of nodes 52 is shown as being included within another node.

Accordingly, *Lowry* does not disclose the claimed "first area [of a parent class] including the second area [of a child class]" at least for this reason.

¹ The Office Action contains statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Moreover, Applicants note that the Examiner further contends that Lowry teaches “a display configured to output at least part of a ‘first area of the one class and at least part of a second area of the child class... the first area including the second area” and cites to various portions of Lowry in support of this assertion. Final Office Action at page 4. None of the cited portions, however, discloses the claimed “first area [of a parent class] including the second area [of a child class].” For example, the cited portion at col. 5, lines 66-67 merely teaches that “[a] form displays information in formats other than as hierarchical graphical listing” but is silent as to display of the claimed “first area” including a “second area.” Also, the cited portion at col. 6, lines 39-43 vaguely discloses “displaying a particular file type,” but does not provide any details as to how the file type is displayed. In addition, the cited portion at col. 7, lines 19-28 discusses chart 50, which, as noted above in regard to Fig. 2A, shows nodes 52 spaced from one another. Lastly, the cited portion at col. 10, lines 15-31 discloses type fields 128, which, as shown in Fig. 6, are provided in separate table entries, and, therefore apparently have associated display areas which are spaced from one another. See also Fig. 7A. There is no teaching in Lowry of displaying such areas within each other. Accordingly, Lowry fails to teach the claimed “first area” including a “second area” for this additional reason.

Amended claim 1 is therefore allowable over Lowry and claims 2-20 are allowable at least due to their dependence from claim 1.

Claims 21 and 22, while of different scope, recite features similar to those recited in claim 1. Claims 21 and 22, therefore, are allowable at least for reasons discussed above in regard to claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Applicants respectfully request that this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 be entered by the Examiner, placing claims 1-22 in condition for allowance. Applicants submit that the proposed amendments of claims 1, 3, 4, 13, 21, and 22 do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Applicants further submit that the entry of the amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.



Dated: April 6, 2007

By: Res. No. 34,731
for Richard V. Burgujian
Reg. No. 31,744